1	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLI	VAN, LLP
	Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)	Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted pro hac vice)
2	dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com	andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
3	Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)	Teuta Fani (admitted pro hac vice)
	sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com	teutafani@quinnemanuel.com
4	555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor	Joseph H. Margolies (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
5	Redwood Shores, CA 94065	josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com
	Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100	191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700 Chicago, IL 60606
6	raesimile: (030) 801-3100	Telephone: (312) 705-7400
7		Facsimile: (312) 705-7401
8	Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)	Josef Ansorge (admitted pro hac vice)
9	stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com	josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
9	Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)	Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)
10	violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)	tracygao@quinnemanuel.com Carl Spilly (admitted <i>pro hac vice)</i>
1.1	crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com	carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
11	Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)	1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
12	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com	Washington D.C., 20005
	865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor	Telephone: (202) 538-8000
13	Los Angeles, CA 90017	Facsimile: (202) 538-8100
14	Telephone: (213) 443-3000	
	Facsimile: (213) 443-3100	
15	In mains Converted (admitted must be a mine)	Length on Tra (CA Dan No. 2054(9)
16	Jomaire Crawford (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com	Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468) jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
	51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor	50 California Street, 22nd Floor
17	New York, NY 10010	San Francisco, CA 94111
18	Telephone: (212) 849-7000	Telephone: (415) 875-6600
10	Facsimile: (212) 849-7100	Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
19		
20	Counsel for Defendant Google LLC	
21	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION	
		,
22	CHASOM BROWN, <i>et al.</i> , individually and on behalf of themselves and all others	Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK
23	similarly situated,	DECLARATION OF JOSEPH H.
	71	MARGOLIES IN SUPPORT OF
24	Plaintiffs,	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
25	v.	PLAINTIFFS' REPLY ISO MOTION TO
		STRIKE PORTIONS OF GOOGLE'S
26	GOOGLE LLC,	SUMMARY JUDGMENT REPLY (DKT.
27	Defendant.	945)
	2 01011011111	Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
28		Tage. Hon. I voime Confeder Rogers

MARGOLIES DECLARATION ISO ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

3 4

5

6

7 8

10

11

9

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22 23

24

25

26

27 28 I, Joseph H. Margolies, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney with Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, attorneys for Defendant Google LLC ("Google") in this action. I have been admitted *pro hac vice* in this matter. Dkt. 681. I am making this declaration pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)–(f) as an attorney for Google as the Designating Party, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f)(3) in response to Dkt. 945.
- 2. On May 3, 2023, Plaintiffs filed their Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Google's Material Should be Sealed regarding Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion to Strike Portions of Google's Summary Judgment Reply (Dkt. 945). On May 3, 2023, I received unredacted service copies of the document sought to be sealed.
- 3. The common law right of public access to judicial proceedings is not a constitutional right and it is "not absolute." Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978); Crowe v. Cty. of San Diego, 210 F. Supp. 2d 1189, 1194 (S.D. Cal. 2002) ("[T]here is no right of access which attaches to all judicial proceedings."). In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a showing that there are "compelling reasons" to seal the information. See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179–80 (9th Cir. 2006). Compelling reasons include "sources of business information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing." Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting Nixon, 435 U.S. at 598–99).
- 4. I have reviewed the documents that Plaintiffs seek to file under seal pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f). Based on my review, there are compelling reasons to seal the following:

Document(s) to be Sealed	Basis for Sealing
Plaintiffs' Reply ISO Motion to	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's
Strike Portions of Google's	highly confidential and proprietary information regarding
Summary Judgment Reply	highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and
	operations, including Google's logs and internal metrics,
Pages 3:14, 3:20–21, 4:2, 4:8	that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary
	course of its business and is not generally known to the
Google joins Plaintiffs' motion to	public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and
seal in PART with respect to this	proprietary information reveals Google's internal
document.	strategies, system designs, and business practices for
	operating and maintaining many of its important services,
	and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order
	entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2–3. Public disclosure

1 2	of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may		
3	alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the		
4	information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.		
5			
6	5. Google's request is narrowly tailored in order to protect its confidential information.		
7	These redactions are limited in scope and volume. Because the proposed redactions are narrowly		
8	tailored and limited to portions containing Google's highly confidential or confidential information,		
9	Google requests that the portions of the aforementioned documents be redacted from any public		
10	version of those documents.		
11	6. Google does not seek to redact or file under seal any portions of Plaintiffs' Reply		
12	ISO Motion to Strike Portions of Google's MSJ Reply not indicated in the table above.		
13	I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true		
14	and correct. Executed in Bayside, Wisconsin on May 9, 2023.		
15			
16			
17	By /s/ Joseph H. Margolies Joseph H. Margolies		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			